



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,586	12/27/2001	Tracee E.J. Eidenschink	1001.1459101	1707

28075 7590 12/23/2003

CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC
1221 NICOLLET AVENUE
SUITE 800
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VI X

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3731

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/034,586

Applicant(s)

EIDENSCHINK, TRACEE E.J.

Examiner

Victor X Nguyen

Art Unit

3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2-3,5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 5-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The limitation "a core member having a proximal end and distal end" in claim 5, line 3 is not defined in the specification and the drawing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 11-13 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Devanaboyina (U.S. 5,571,114).

Devanaboyina discloses in figs 1, 3, col. 1, lines 65-67, col. 2, lines 1-15, col. 6, lines 66-67 and col. 7, lines 1-12, a system having all the limitations of claims 1-2, including: an elongate shaft (12); a raised/tread pattern (see col. 5, lines 14-22) disposed on the outer surface. The raised/tread pattern comprises a plurality of diamond shapes (see col. 5, lines 18-23).

Art Unit: 3731

Regarding claims 3-4, Devanaboyina discloses the transmission of torque comprises a plurality of bearing points (see col. 6, lines 23-28) that contacts one another when the elongate shaft (12) is torqued.

Regarding claims 5, 11-13 and 20-22, Devanaboyina discloses in figs 1, 3, col. 1, lines 65-67, col. 2, lines 1-15, col. 6, lines 66-67 and col. 7, lines 1-12, a system having all the limitations of claims 5, 11-13 and 20-22, including: an elongate shaft (12); a raised/tread pattern (see col. 5, lines 14-22) disposes on the outer surface. The raised/tread pattern comprises a plurality of bearing points (see col. 6, lines 23-28) that contacts one another when the elongate shaft (12) is torqued; and wherein the catheter is a guide catheter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-10 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Devanaboyina (U.S. 5,571,114).

Regarding claims 6-7 and 15-16, the recited claims, "the raised pattern is formed by laser ablation or by overmolding" is not given any patentable weight since this is a product by process limitations that are not constructed as being limited to the product formed by the specific process recited. In re Hirao et al., 535 F2d 67, 190 U.S.P.Q. 15. Whether a product is patentable depends on whether it is known in the art or it is obvious, and is not governed by whether the process by which it is made patentable. In Re Klug, 333 f2d

742, 180 U.S.P.Q. 161 (CCPA 1974). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the raised pattern is formed by laser ablation or by overmolding, since a comparison of the recited process with the prior art process does not serve to resolve the issue concerning patentability of the product. Regarding claims 8-10 and 17-19, the recited claims "the raised pattern is formed by hot die casting/embossing or by extrusion" is not given any patentable weight since this is a product by process limitations that are not constructed as being limited to the product formed by the specific process recited. In re Hirao et al., 535 F2d 67, 190 U.S.P.Q. 15. Whether a product is patentable depends on whether it is known in the art or it is obvious, and is not governed by whether the process by which it is made patentable. In Re Klug, 333 f2d 742, 180 U.S.P.Q. 161 (CCPA 1974). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the raised pattern is formed by hot die casting/embossing or by extrusion, since a comparison of the recited process with the prior art process does not serve to resolve the issue concerning patentability of the product.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Devanaboyina (5,571,114) in view of Moore et al (4,669,465).

Art Unit: 3731

Regarding claim 14, Devanaboyina is explained as before. However, Devanaboyina does not disclose the catheter is a balloon catheter.

Moore et al teach the catheter is a balloon catheter (fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 25-27).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the same time the invention was made to modify Devanaboyina by adding the catheter is a balloon catheter as taught by Moore et al in order to create an overall system with added capability into a body lumen.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No. 5,766,164 to Mueller

U.S. Pat. No. 6,602,225 to Eidenschink

U.S. Pat. No. 5,549,551 to Peacock

U.S. Pat. No. 3,878,849 to Muller


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor X Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4898. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8-4.30 P.M).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Milano can be reached on (703) 308-2496. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 305-3590 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

Victor X Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 3731

vn ✓
December 09, 2003


MICHAEL J. MILANO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700